

REMARKS:

ELECTION/RESTRICTION

The present application was subject to restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. §121. According to the Office Action, claims 1 through 7 represent Group I that addresses a coating apparatus, classified in class 156, subclass 487. Claims 8 through 23 represent Group II that deals with a method of coating, classified in class 156, subclass 275.7.

Applicants have affirmed the election of Group II, including claims 8, through 23, of the present invention. Election is made without traverse.

Claims 1 – 7 have been cancelled thereby withdrawing them from further consideration in the present application.

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The Office Action raised objection to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character “5” in Figure 1 was used to designate both adhesive and non-adhesive areas.

A replacement Figure 1 is included with this response to overcome the objection by more accurately positioning reference character “5.”

Further objection was made under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the drawings did not show every feature of the invention specified in the claim 15 of the present application.

Claim 15 has been cancelled to overcome objection to the drawings.

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION:

The disclosure on page 14, paragraph 69 was subject to objection by the Examiner due to misspelling of the word “air,” which appeared as “sir.”

An amended paragraph [0069] is part of this response to overcome objection to the specification.

Request is made for reconsideration and withdrawal of objection to the specification.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

According to the Office Action claims 10 through 25 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim.

Applicants submit that objection to claims should include claims 10 through 23, since claim 23 was the last claim previously presented.

The problem of multiple dependent claims depending from any other multiple dependent claim was removed by cancellation of claims 1 – 7. Claims elected for examination include independent claims 8 and 9 and dependent claims 10 - 23. Following cancellation of claims 15 and 16, the remaining dependent claims are claims having multiple dependency from claim 8 and claim 9.

Objection was also made to claims 8 and 9. Claim 8 in the 7th line required replacement of “a ad” by --and--. In the 10th line of claim 8 it was necessary to remove the apostrophe next to “of.”

With regard to claim 9, it was necessary to change “a rid adhesive” to --and adhesive-- on the 4th line of the claim.

Applicants addressed each of the objections by making changes to overcome them. Accordingly, request is made for reconsideration and withdrawal of objections to claims 8 – 23.

REMARKS REGARDING CLAIMS AMENDMENTS:

Claims 1 – 7 have been cancelled due to restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. §121 whereby these claims were withdrawn from further consideration in the present application.

Claim 15 and dependent claim 16 have been cancelled to overcome objection related to omission from the drawings of limitations recited in claim 15.

Amendment of claims 8, 9 and 14 places them in condition for allowance by overcoming several objections as well as rejection of claims 8, 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112 and claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Request is respectfully made for entry of new claims 24 – 26, which claims find support at page 14, paragraphs [0049] and [0050] and at page 16, paragraph [0055] of the present application, as filed.

Claims 8 – 14 and 17– 26 are pending herein.

IN RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION:

CLAIMS REJECTIONS – 35 USC §112

The Office Action indicated rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 8, the use of the term “and/or” multiple times was considered by the Examiner to render the claim indefinite.

Claim 8 has been amended to eliminate the use of “and/or” to clarify that varying physical properties of a composite layer structure according to the present invention depends upon properties and positioning of fibers included in the core sheet. Support for amended claim 8 exists on page 19, paragraph [0067] and page 28 paragraph [0095] of the application as filed, for example.

Although the Office Action did not indicate specific rejections, the issue was addressed that claims 14, 15 and 16 also recited the term “and/or.” Applicants overcame the suggestion of rejection by canceling claims 15 and 16 and amending claim 14 to remove the term “and/or.”

Claim 9 has also been amended to provide antecedent basis and clarify use of the limitation “the cover sheet.”

Following amendment of claims 8, 9 and 14 applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

CLAIMS REJECTIONS – 35 USC §102

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (US 3,684,637).

In response to the Office Action applicants have considered the Examiner’s selection of Anderson et al. as a basis for claims rejection, but respectfully disagree that the reference meets the teaching requirements of an anticipating reference under 35 U.S.C. §102.

As stated in the Office Action, with respect to claim 8, “Anderson et al. teaches a method for producing a laminate with cover sheets (19, 40) and a core there between comprising adhesive and fibers. Before the two cover sheets are joined together, one cover sheet (19) is applied with

adhesive (23) and the other cover sheet (40) is initially applied with adhesive (42) and then fibers of different kinds (52) from a flock supply (53).”

Applicants submit that the teachings of Anderson et al. are limited to application of fibers (flock) to adhesive full-coated on one side of a fabric cover sheet. The flock coated fabric joins to the full-coated adhesive side of a second sheet to form a composite laminate (column 3, lines 47 – 54). The reference is, however, silent regarding “varying (of) physical properties of the composite layer structure” as recited in claim 8. Also, Anderson et al. only teaches cover sheets having one side full-coated with adhesive. Such teachings fail to anticipate “applying the adhesive (5) onto predetermined specific areas of the cover sheets,” which is also recited in amended claim 8 of the present invention.

A further omission from the teachings of Anderson et al. is the capability, recited in claim 8 of the present invention, of varying physical properties of the composite layer structure “by applying the fibers (9) of varying kind depending on density and thickness and length and material and orientation relative to the cover sheets.”

It appears that requirements for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, i.e. that “each and every element” of the claimed invention must be found either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference, has not been met. For this reason the reference of Anderson et al. is ineffective for anticipating claim 8 of the present invention. Therefore, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

The Office Action also indicated rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable by Sobolev (US 5,030,488).

Sobolev teaches a method for producing laminates comprising two sheets with a filled, reinforced resin core (Abstract). Before the two sheets are joined together, one cover sheet is coated with a mixture of adhesive and fibers by a spray nozzle. The teachings of Sobolev address the spray coating of an adhesive and fiber mixture to one side of a sheet with full coverage of the surface area of the coated side. Such teachings do not anticipate the capability of the present invention for “locally varying physical properties of the composite layer - - - by locally applying the mixture only onto predetermined areas.” The benefits associated with applying adhesive and

fibers to only predetermined, specific areas of the cover sheet is discussed in the present application on page 14, paragraph [0049] to page 16, paragraph [0055], for example.

Failing to teach variation of physical properties of composite layers by limiting the areas of the cover sheet to which adhesive and fibers may be applied, Sobolev is defective for teaching “each and every element” of the invention according to amended claim 9 of the present invention.

In view of the previous discussion, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to respond to all the points included in the Office Action and, in view of the above, submit that amendment of claims 8, 9 and 14 and cancellation of claims 15 and 16 places the application in condition for allowance. Consequently, request is respectfully made for reconsideration of the application and notification of allowance of claims 8 – 14 and claims 17 – 23 along with new claims 24 - 26 in the next paper from the Office.

Serial No.: 10/711,645
Confirmation No.: 5644
Applicant: KARLSSON, Jerry
Atty. Ref.: 7589.207.PCUS00

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437, referencing Order No. 7589.207.PCUS00.

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner should directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tracy W. Druce". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Tracy" and last name "Druce" clearly distinguishable.

Tracy W. Druce
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 35,493
Tel. 713.571.3451